

BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

335 Second Crown Point Road Barrington, NH 03825 Phone: (603) 332-2863

Fax: (603) 335-4623 www.BerrySurveying.Com

October 12, 2021

Barrington Planning Board Attention: Marcia Gasses PO Box 660 Barrington, NH 03825

Re: Site Plan Review

Berry Surveying & Engineering Dove Development Group, LLC The Village at Barrington Square Tax Map 235, Lot 2 1-1 & 3

Based on comments from Planning Board and associated members, we respectfully submit the following comments and revisions. Our comments are in **bold**.

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

1. The colored renderings and Sheet 31 do not indicate a walkway along High Point Drive or a walkway between the residences and the mixed use building as discussed during the design review to preclude people walking in the roadway.

A sidewalk has been added along High Point Drive and the color rendering has been updated accordingly. Please see corresponding plans.

Looking at Sheet 30 showing the emergency access road, there are no measures or signage to prevent people from using the emergency access and the private drive.

Signage is now proposed at this location indicating an "emergency use & private access only" See sheet #32.

3. On Sheet 35 the title states "Community Lane" instead of "Community Way."

This has been corrected. See sheet #37.

4. Sheet 36 indicates ~220' of Community Way leading out the development with only a catch basin at the bottom. Is this appropriate/desirable?

These two catch basins have been revised to be double NHDOT type "B" grates, as the structures are located at the start of a 7% section of roadway. At the 50 – Year storm event, 0.79 and 0.89 Cubic Feet per Second (CFS) enters the catch basin grates on the left and right side of the road, respectively. The proposed NHDOT style "B" grate proposed is a 2'X2' grate with 2.4 SF of open area/grate (4.8 SF total). According to Neenah Foundry Company engineering specifications, this would allow for allow for up to 10 CFS to enter the grate without ponding.

5. On Sheet 42 the emergency access road is shown to have a 9.75% slope. Although turning radius into the road is shown to be acceptable on Sheet 105, was sudden increase in slope examined that it will not pose a problem with the rear of a fire truck bottoming out?

Based upon conversation and other review comments, this profile has been revised to 9%.

6. Sheet 56 does not specify any maintenance requirements for Pond #110 as there are for the rain gardens and gravel wetlands even though it has a sediment forebay and outlet structure. Shouldn't here be?

Sheet #58 has been revised to show maintenance requirements.

7. On the Landscape plans L-01 and L-02, the numbers in the planting schedules do not match. Additionally, the numbers do not match the drawings (e.g. both tables list 18 arborvitae but the drawings show 22). The schedules also don't' include all species; junipers are shown on the drawings but not in the tables.

Landscape Plans have been revised. Please find sheets L-01 and L-02.

8. A match line for drawings L-01 and L-02 would be helpful.

A match line has been added. Please find sheets L-01 and L-02.

9. The profiles of the septic systems on Sheets 65 and 69 show a disproportionally small pump chamber versus the septic tank, and the pump is shown in the septic tank vice the pump chamber, which conflicts with the detail of the pump chamber in Detail U17 on Sheet 99.

Septic designs have been revised.



10. On Sheets 67 & 70 under the note labeled "Plan Intent" the distances for the height above the high point are not specified; there are simply Xs as place holders.

Septic designs have been revised.

11. On Sheet 71 under Field at Test Pit #323 it states to "See sheet X for details."

Septic designs have been revised.

12. On Sheet 71, why is the height of the low point vent significantly below that of other vents given there is mention elsewhere of concern for maintaining vent heights above the snowline?

Septic designs have been revised.

13. Suggest repeating legend of Sheet 72 for utility symbols to preclude having the go back 70 pages to find them.

Discussed as part of discussion on requirement for all pages of the plan to have legends. Please find attached waiver request.

14. Add EDA abbreviations in the legend(s).

See revised legends.

15. On Sheets 75/76/77, 1.5' of separation is specified between the water and sewer lines. Is there a specification for minimum distance between the electrical and cable conduits and the water/sewer lines?

As discussed there is no requirement.

16.On Sheet 90, in Detail E6, Note #4 states, "Subject to (E) below, the mix shall ..." There is no note or footnote "E" in this block or any other on the sheet.

This has been revised. See sheet #92.

17. The Parking Space Detail on Sheet 92 states width as "Varies". Shouldn't there be minimum width specified as there is for the wheelchair ramp detail?

This has been revised. See sheet #94.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

18. Detail U1 specifies a depth for gas lines. Are gas lines to be installed in the development?

As discussed, gas lines are proposed for individual LP tanks located closely to the units. See sheets #78-80 and project legends.

Very truly yours, BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

Christopher Berry, SIT Principal, President

Kenneth A. Berry, PE, LLS, CPSWQ, CPESC, CESSWI

K_OR

Principal: VP – Technical Operations

K.Berry@BerrySurveying.Com

Cell: (603) 978-0358

Kevin Poulin, EIT Project Engineer

